

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

JEFFREY EDWARD MOSS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CAROLYN PRESCOTT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:16-CV-10 (MTT)

ORDER

This case is presently before the Court on Plaintiff Jeffrey Edward Moss's Motion to Reconsider (Doc. 89) this Court's Order (Doc. 84) denying Moss's Motion to Amend (Doc. 81). Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, "Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice." M.D. Ga., L.R. 7.6. Indeed, "reconsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly." *Bingham v. Nelson*, 2010 WL 339806, at *1 (M.D. Ga.) (quotation marks and citation omitted). It "is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law." *Id.* "In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate [his] prior arguments, and any arguments which the party inadvertently failed to raise earlier are deemed waived." *McCoy v. Macon Water Authority*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997). The Court denied Moss's Motion to Amend (Doc. 81) because it was "duplicative of his previous allegations and fail[ed] to state a claim for relief." Doc. 84 at 3. Moss has raised no change in the law,

newly discovered evidence, or clear error to justify reconsideration of that order.

Accordingly, his Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 89) is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this the 6th day of November, 2017.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT